

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of)
Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of)
The Cable Communications Policy Act) **MB Docket No. 05-311**
Of 1984 as Amended by the Cable)
Television Consumer Protection and)
Competition Act of 1992)

COMMENTS OF JASON GLENN HOPKINS

I. INTRODUCTION

Dear Chairman Martin:

I am pleased to have this opportunity to offer comments in response to the Federal Communication Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. While I served as President and Chief Executive Officer of the Hopkins House Association, for the record, I am addressing the Commission on behalf of myself and not espousing the position of the Hopkins House Association. However, please be aware that Hopkins House is based in Alexandria, Virginia and provides education programs and services to economically disadvantaged children and their families. Through high-quality preschools, financial literacy, and science programs, Hopkins House offers to children and families the skills they will need for a life time of learning.

I am also an Advisory Board member of Consumers for Cable Choice (C4CC) and support the work of C4CC to lower cable costs by creating a more competitive cable market.¹

Given my work with the disadvantaged and poor, high cable rates do resonate with those who have less disposable income. I am concerned that existing franchise laws allow local cable companies to maintain a monopoly that is extremely unfair to the poor. I believe that the time has come for the Commission to remove those barriers impeding the entrance of new video providers to the marketplace.

¹ Consumers for Cable Choice, Inc. is a not-for-profit corporation formed under Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Competition will ensure better services and new, innovative technologies for the low income communities in general. Competition will also lower high cable rates which have risen 56.6% since 1996, according to a Federal Communications Commission 2004 Report on Cable Industry Prices. Finally, competition will serve to create other communities similar to Keller, Texas where prices dropped when Verizon was awarded a franchise to provide its FIOS service. Consumers in Keller, Texas now have a choice among comparable rates because the incumbent cable provider has lowered its prices.

In conclusion, the current franchising process unfairly affects the poor and disadvantaged. However, the Commission does have the wherewithal to remove barriers blocking the entrance of new service providers to the market.

By: J. Glenn Hopkins

February 13, 2006